SINGLE BENCH

-1- C.S. 1006

3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, AT - BILASPUR

W. P. No. 2593 OF 2006

PETITIONER : SAKHA RAM KUNJAM
AGED – 43 YEARS
SON OF SHRI SONAU RAM KUNJAM
POSTED AS - ASSISTANT PROFESSOR,
AT – GOVT. COLLEGE, NARAYANPUR,
DISTRICT – BASTER (C. G.)
R/O NARAYANPUR (BASTER)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :

1. STATE OF CHHATTISGARH
THROUGH – THE SECRETARY,
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
MANTRALAYA D. K. S. BHAWAN, RAIPUR

2. SHRI KAMLESH KUMAR MARKAM,
POSTED AS – ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
AT – GOVT. COLLEGE, CHARAMA,
DISTRICT – BASTER (C. G.)

P.R. No. 2000/06
Presented by Shri B.R.K. Keshurwani
dated 12/4/06

WRIT PETITION U/A - 226 & 227 of Constitution of India

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

36

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP No. 25-93/06 सन् 2006

.....विरुद्ध.....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	12.6.2006:- Shri R.K. Kesharwani, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Ashutosh Kachchwaha, Govt. Advocate for the State/ respondent No.1. Heard both the counsel. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed along with respondent No.2 on the post of Assistant Professor on 23rd December 1989. The respondent No.2 was regularized with effect from 24.12.98 whereas the petitioner has been regularized with effect from 2005. The petitioner and respondent No.2 were appointed on the same day. The petitioner was not regularized in the year 1998 when respondent No.2 was regularized. Thus a discriminatory treatment has been given to the petitioner and for that the petitioner has made a representation Annexure-P/6 to the Commissioner, Higher Education, but nothing has been done so far. In the circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a detailed representation to respondent No.1 and he be directed to decide representation of the petitioner considering his grievance to which learned counsel for respondent No.1 has no objection. Request made by learned counsel for the petitioner is just and fair. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is directed to make a detailed representation to respondent No. 1 within a period of 2 weeks from today and in turn respondent No.1 is directed to decide representation of the petitioner within a period of 4 months from the date	

[पीछे देखिये

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

37

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

of receipt of representation, after considering all the grievances raised in the representation, in accordance with law.

With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of.

Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order.

Sd/-
L.C. Bhadoo
Judge

Parve

14.6.05

[पीछे देखिये